



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/073,748 05/06/98 WEISSMAN

C 20308.702

024251 WM01/0731
SKJERVEN MORRILL MACPHERSON LLP
25 METRO DRIVE
SUITE 700
SAN JOSE CA 95110

EXAMINER

COLBERT, E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED:

07/31/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/073,748

Applicant(s)

Weissman et al

Examiner

Ella Colbert

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 25, 2001
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 88-132 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 88-132 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 10
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2172

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 88- 132 are pending in this communication. Claims 48-87 have been canceled in this communication filed 05/25/01, entered as Supplemental Amendment C, paper number 11.
2. Applicants' Pre-Amendment B filed 03/26/01 has been entered as paper number 8.
3. Applicants' CPA filed 03/26/01 has been entered as paper number 9.

Specification

4. The Specification is objected to because The Applicant's have a description as a table of contents on pages 8-9. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
5. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout and content for patent applications. These guidelines are suggested for the applicants' use.

Arrangement of the Specification

The following order or arrangement is preferred in framing the specification and, except for the reference to "Microfiche Appendix" and the drawings, each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as section headings. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) Title of the Invention.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research or Development.
- (d) Reference to a "Microfiche Appendix" (see 37 CFR 1.96).

Art Unit: 2172

(e) Background of the Invention.

1. Field of the Invention.
2. Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

(f) Brief Summary of the Invention.

(g) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s).

(h) Detailed Description of the Invention.

(I) Claim or Claims (commencing on a separate sheet).

(j) Abstract of the Disclosure (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) Drawings.

(l) Sequence Listing (see 37 CFR 1.821-1.825).

Claim Objections

6. Claims 90, 100, 107, 116, 123, and 129 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 90, page 2, lines 3-4 and lines 5-6, recites the limitation "... the populated metadata scheme." Claims 100, 107, 116, 123, and 129 have a similar problem. It is not clear to the Examiner if the Applicants' meant for the claim limitation to recite "... the populated metadata scheme" or "... the populated metadata schema." For Examination purposes and for consistency the Examiner assumes the Applicants' meant "... the populated metadata schema." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 92, page 2, line 7, recites "... the client computers;". The claim limitation should appropriately recite "... the client computers." Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2172

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 88-90, 105-107, and 121-123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,675,785) Hall et al, hereafter Hall.

With respect to claim 88, accessing at least one description wherein the description describes a database system (col. 3, lines 52-56), populating a metadata schema with the description (col. 6, lines 13-26), automatically generating the database system according to the populated metadata schema (col. 3, lines 57-67 and col. 4, lines 1-2), and using the database system according to the populated metadata schema (col. 4, lines 3-15). Hall did not explicitly teach populating a metadata schema with the description but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to populate the metadata schema with a description and to incorporate in Hall because such a modification would enhance Hall's fact and reference tables which contain the attributes of the entries in the fact table which are typically linked to the reference tables through one or more keyed columns containing code.

With respect to claim 89, automatically generating an actual table schema for the database

Art Unit: 2172

system according to the populated metadata schema (col. 4, lines 37-46 and fig. 2 (11-15) and automatically populating the actual table schema with the data (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-8).

With respect to claim 90, automatically generating one or more aggregates according to the populated metadata scheme (col. 6, lines 12-18 and lines 62-67 and col. 7, line 1) and automatically generating one or more query mechanisms according to the populated metadata scheme (col. 7, lines 1-4 and lines 10-67 and col. 8, lines 1-9).

With respect to claim 105, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 88.

With respect to claim 106, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 89.

With respect to claim 107, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 90.

With respect to claim 121, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 105.

With respect to claim 122, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 106.

With respect to claim 123, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 107.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

Art Unit: 2172

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 91-104, 108-120, and 124-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of (US 5,721,903) Anand et al, hereafter Anand.

With respect to claim 91, Hall did not teach, querying the database system and generating one or more reports with the database system. Anand teaches, querying the database system (col. 1, lines 38-46) and generating one or more reports with the database system (col. 1, lines 48-63 and col. 2, lines 1-9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to query a database system and to generate one or more reports with the database system and to incorporate Hall's accessing a description with Anand's querying a database system to generate one or more reports because such a modification would allow a more efficient means of data retrieval and analyzation of data without requiring the user to have an knowledge of underlying data structures.

With respect to claim 92, Hall did not teach, querying the database system in response to a query request received from one or more client computers over a computer network, sending the results of the querying to one or more of the client computers, generating the reports in response to a report request received from one or more of the client computers over a computer network, and sending the results of the report generating to one or more of the client computers. Anand

Art Unit: 2172

073,748

teaches, querying the database system in response to a query request received from one or more client computers over a computer network (col. 5, lines 50-67 and col. 6, lines 1-12), sending the results of the querying to one or more of the client computers (col. 11, lines 33-36), generating the reports in response to a report request received from one or more of the client computers over a computer network (col. 11, lines 35-41), and sending the results of the report generating to one or more of the client computers (col. 11, lines 42-52). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to query the database system in response to a query request received from one or more client computers over a computer network, send the results of the query to one or more of the client computers, generate the reports in response to a report request received from one or more of the client computers over a computer network, and send the results of the report generation to one or more of the client computers and to incorporate Hall's metadata schema with Anand's querying the database system, sending the results of the query to one or more client computers, generating the reports in response to a report request, and sending the results of the report generation because such a modification would enhance the ability of a user to more efficiently retrieve data and to analyze the data prior to sending it to the client computers (computers that access shared network resources provided by another computer called a server).

With respect to claim 93, Hall did not teach, automatically extracting data from one or more source databases according to the populated metadata schema, and automatically populating the database system with the data according to the populated metadata schema. Anand teaches, automatically extracting data from one or more source databases according to the populated

Art Unit: 2172

metadata schema (col. 3, lines 59-62 and col. 4, lines 24-29), and automatically populating the database system with the data according to the populated metadata schema (col. 4, lines 38-45 and col. 10, lines 30-37). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically extract data from one or more source databases according to the populated metadata schema and automatically populate the database system with the data according to the populated metadata schema and to incorporate Hall's metadata schema with Anand's automatically extracted data from one or more source databases according to the populated metadata schema and to automatically populate the database system with the data according to the populated metadata schema because such a modification would give the ability to of the system to execute the request of events that involve a warehouse request in which the data from a source database is extracted, transferred, transformed, and loaded into a target database. The source database represents all of the data sources from which data will be extracted to populate the metadata schema and the data warehouse or data mart.

With respect to claim 94, Hall did not teach, automatically populating the database system includes automatically converting the data into one or more data formats according to the populated metadata schema. Anand teaches, automatically populating the database system including automatically converting the data into one or more data formats according to the populated metadata schema (col. 1, lines 28-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically populate the database system including automatically converting the data into one or more data formats according to the populated metadata schema and to incorporate Hall's use of the database system to populate the

Art Unit: 2172

metadata schema with Anand's automatically populating the database system including automatically converting the data into one or more data formats according to the populated metadata schema because such a modification would allow Hall's system the ability to provide for translating graphical user interface requests, manipulate data views, have rules for selecting default parameters for converting the data, and choose layout and display formats for generating the text data for the reports.

With respect to claim 95, Hall nor Anand did not teach, receiving the description from a client computer over a network, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive the description from a client computer over a network because the client computer has the ability to access shared network resources provided by another computer called a server in a network or Internet environment.

With respect to claim 96, Hall did not teach, accessing a modified description wherein the modified description includes the description and one or more modifications to the description, re-populating the metadata schema with the modified description, automatically modifying the database system according to the re-populated metadata schema, and using the database system according to the re-populated metadata schema. Anand teaches, accessing a modified description wherein the modified description includes the description and one or more modifications to the description (col. 8, lines 14-23), re-populating the metadata schema with the modified description, automatically modifying the database system according to the re-populated metadata schema (col. 8, lines 24-67), and using the database system according to the re-populated metadata schema (col. 13, lines 21-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2172

time the invention was made to access a modified description wherein the modified description includes the description and one or more modifications to the description, re-populating the metadata schema with the modified description, automatically modifying the database system according to the re-populated metadata schema, and using the database system according to the re-populated metadata schema and to incorporate Hall's accessing a description of a database system with Anand's access a modified description wherein the modified description includes the description and one or more modifications to the description, re-populating the metadata schema with the modified description, automatically modifying the database system according to the re-populated metadata schema, and using the database system according to the re-populated metadata schema because such a modification would because such a modification would give the ability to of the system to execute the request of events that involve a warehouse request in which the data from a source database is extracted, transferred, transformed, and loaded into a target database. The database system represents all of the data sources from which data will be extracted to populate and to re-populate the metadata schema and to re-populate the meta schema and the data warehouse or data mart.

With respect to claim 97, Hall nor Anand did not teach, the data in the database system is not lost during the modification, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the data in the database system not lost during modification because the client system is capable of handling several kinds of user modifications and updates and the user has the ability to save the data before and after modification by the use of a storage medium.

Art Unit: 2172

With respect to claim 98, Hall did not teach, automatically extracting data from one or more source databases according to the re-populated metadata schema, automatically converting data into one or more source modified data formats according to the re-populated metadata schema, and automatically populating the database system with the data according to the populated metadata schema. Anand teaches, automatically extracting data from one or more source databases according to the re-populated metadata schema (col. 2, lines 30-32), automatically converting data into one or more source modified data formats according to the re-populated metadata schema (col. 14, lines 35-40), and automatically populating the database system with the data according to the populated metadata schema (col. 4, lines 38-45 and col. 10, 30-37). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically extract data from one or more source databases according to the re-populated metadata schema, automatically convert the data to one or more modified data formats according to the re-populated metadata schema and automatically populate the database system with the data according to the populated metadata schema and to incorporate Hall's metadata schema with Anand's automatically extracted data from one or more source databases according to the re-populated metadata schema, automatically convert the data to one or more modified data formats according to the re-populated metadata schema, and to automatically populate the database system with the data according to the populated metadata schema because such a modification would give the system the ability to execute the request of events that involve a warehouse request in which the data from a source database is extracted, transferred, transformed, and loaded into a target database. The source database represents all of the data

Art Unit: 2172

sources from which data will be extracted to populate the metadata schema and the data warehouse or data mart.

With respect to claim 99, Hall nor Anand did not teach, automatically modifying the actual table schema for the database system according to the re-populated metadata schema, and automatically populating the modified actual table schema with the data, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the actual table schema for the database system according to the re-populated metadata schema and to populate the modified actual table schema with the data because such a modification would give the system the ability to execute the request of events that involve a warehouse request in which the data from a source database is extracted, transferred, transformed, and loaded into a target database.

With respect to claim 100, Hall did not teach, automatically modifying one or more aggregates according to the re-populated metadata schema and automatically modifying one or more query mechanisms according to the re-populated metadata schema.

Anand teaches, automatically modifying one or more aggregates according to the re-populated metadata schema (col. 15, lines 15-31) and automatically modifying one or more query mechanisms according to the re-populated metadata schema (col. 15, lines 1-14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically modifying one or more aggregates according to the re-populated metadata schema and automatically modify one or more query mechanisms according to the re-populated metadata schema and Hall's generation of one or more aggregates with Anand's modification of one or

Art Unit: 2172

more aggregates according to the re-populated meta schema and modifying one or more query mechanisms according to the re-populated metadata schema because such a modification would enhance Anand's system's ability to include structured query language aggregates and functions to provide various statistics and to execute the request of events that involve querying a database to extract and to re-populate the data in a data warehouse or data mart.

With respect to claim 101, Hall did not teach, automatically modifying the actual table schema includes modifying one or more tables in the actual table schema. Anand teaches, automatically modifying the actual table schema includes modifying one or more tables in the actual table schema (col. 2, col. 36-38 and col. 4, lines 30-33 and lines 42-45). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically modify the actual table schema including modifying one or more tables in the actual table schema and to incorporate Hall's automatically extracting data with Anand's automatically modifying the actual table schema including modifying one or more tables because such a modification would further expand the usage of Anand's system and make the schema more efficient.

With respect to claim 102, Hall nor Anand did not teach, adding one or more of the tables, deleting one or more of the tables, adding one or more of the columns to the tables, and deleting one or more of the columns from the tables, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add one or more tables, delete one or more tables, add one or more column to the tables, and delete one or more of the columns from the tables because this is well known in the art of relational databases with tables.

Art Unit: 2172

A relational database stores information in tables, rows and columns of data and conducts searches by using data in specified columns of one table to find additional data in another table. The rows of data and the columns represent fields and these match the data from one field in one table with the data in a corresponding field of another table to produce a third table that combines requested data from both tables.

With respect to claim 103, Hall nor Anand explicitly teaches, the tables include any of the following: one or more fact tables, one or more dimension tables, or one or more aggregate tables. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the tables include fact tables, dimension tables, and aggregate tables in view of Hall's teachings of summarized fact tables and aggregates in col. 1, lines 47-50 and col. 2, lines 12-15 and Anand teaches, dimensions in col. 15, lines 1-45 because together Hall and Anand teach, one or more fact tables, dimensions, and aggregates and these tables meet several needs such as the need for higher performance on many queries since the tables are structured closer to the end users needs.

With respect to claim 104, Hall nor Anand explicitly teaches, wherein automatically modifying the database system further includes modifying one or more indices in the database system, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the database system to include modifying one or more indices in the database system because an index is simply a listing of keywords and associated data that point to the location of more comprehensive information, such as files and records on a disk or record keys in a database and requires modifying occasionally.

Art Unit: 2172

With respect to claim 108, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 91.

With respect to claim 109, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 92.

With respect to claim 110, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 93.

With respect to claim 111, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 94.

With respect to claim 112, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 95.

With respect to claim 113, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 96.

With respect to claim 114, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 98.

With respect to claim 115, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 99.

With respect to claim 116, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 100.

With respect to claim 117, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 101.

With respect to claim 118, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given

Art Unit: 2172

for claim 102.

With respect to claim 119, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 103.

With respect to claim 120, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 104.

With respect to claim 124, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 108.

With respect to claim 125, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 113.

With respect to claim 126, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 97.

With respect to claim 127, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 114.

With respect to claim 128, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 115.

With respect to claim 129, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 116.

With respect to claim 130, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 117.

With respect to claim 131, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 118.

Art Unit: 2172

With respect to claim 132, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 120.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Rosensteel, Jr. et al (US 6, 167,405) taught automatically populating a data warehouse.

Knutson et al (US 5,870,746) taught a data warehouse and metadata.

Anand et al (US 5,832,496) taught data warehousing and the retrieval of data.

INQUIRIES

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Ms. Ella Colbert whose telephone number is (703) 308-7064. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 6:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. EST. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on (703)305-4393.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703)308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry).

Or:

Application/Control Number: 09/294,056 ^{073,748}

18

Art Unit: 2172

(703)308-5403 (for informal or draft communications, please label

“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, Virginia., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-9600.

E. Colbert

E. Colbert

July 28, 2001

Kim Vu

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100